

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have amended independent claims 3, 55, and 69 to each recite that a portion of the surface consists essentially of palladium. Applicants have also made other minor amendments to these claims to more smoothly incorporate the “consisting essentially of palladium” recitation.

Claims 3-15, 55-59, and 69-75 remain pending for examination.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 3-15, 55-59 and 69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schnur, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,079,600 (“Schnur”).

It is not seen where Schnur discloses or suggests a surface having a portion that consists essentially of palladium. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Schnur teaches a surface comprising copper, which is not a surface consisting essentially of palladium. Instead, Schnur teaches only that palladium chloride (PdCl<sub>2</sub>) is used to rinse a copper surface during its formation. Thus, Schnur does not teach or suggest a surface that has a portion that consists essentially of palladium. Accordingly, it is believed that claims 3-15, 55-59 and 69 are patentable in view of Schnur, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 70-75 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schnur in view of Clark, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,728,591 (“Clark”).

Claims 70-75 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 69. For at least the reasons explained above with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of Schnur alone, the premise of the rejection of claim 69 (that Schnur teaches all of the limitations of claim 69) is believed to be incorrect. Accordingly, while Applicants do not concede that there would have been any rational reason to combine Schnur and Clark in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the present rejection cannot stand, regardless. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 70-75 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after the foregoing remarks, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by the electronically filed credit card payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: 05/19/08

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Timothy J. Oyer, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 36,628

Tani Chen, Sc.D.

Registration No.: 52,728

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000